OPEN PEER REVIEW

Open Peer Review (OPR)

As a new feature for progressing towards transparency, we decided to open a new window for all of our editors as well as authors titled "**Open Peer Review**". We hope by this new facility, our reviewers will be more motivated and authors will be more satisfied with the review process. We believe that publishing our peer review reports could make a transparent and clear environment for all our efforts within a journal, but not all reviewers tend to publish their comments.

What is "Open Peer Review" process?

An "Open Peer Review" process is making the details of all review process (including reviewers, associate editors, and EICs comments) as "Public" as it is agreed by EIC, Authors, and reviewers.

Advantages of "Open Peer Review" process

- More transparency, constructiveness and tactful comments of the peer review process: leads to an increase in the quality of reviews
- More motivations for all involved roles in the review process
- Authors' satisfactions from the review process: Increases honesty between authors and reviewers
- Education of both authors and new students
- Prevents reviewers from following their individual agendas and leading to the detection of reviewers' conflicts of interests

You can find out more at:
https://brieflands.com/briefland/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#opr.html

Health Scope
Article DOI: https://doi.org/10.5812/jhealthscope-123211
Published in: Health Scope: 11(3); e123211

Peer Review Report for "Impact of the COVID-19 on the Health System and Healthcare Workers: A Systematic Review"

Author(s): Mubashir Zafar

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 7 Feb 2022
Revised Date: 12 Jun 2022
Accepted Date: 29 Jun 2022

Revision (0)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

Fatemeh Setoodehzadeh: Reviewer | Revision (0)

1 Mar 2022

Dear Authors,
Abstract, Method: Specify the search time frame.
Has the search been for articles from a specific country or region? Indicate detail.
Introduction: Sources in the text should be written according to the journal instructions. It is recommended to see one of the published papers in the last issue of the journal.
The structure of the article should be based on the journal. The Objective section should be written after the introduction.
Method: Why the 2020 articles have not been reviewed?
Please rewrite chart number 1 based on PRISMA flowchart.
Table 1, Kindly indicate the title of the paper, sample size, and country.
Table 1, kindly write the result of the study in more detail. E.g. What challenges have occurred for the health system and manpower?
Write the discussion section separately.
Indicate the grant number after the conclusion section.
Have the authors cited their articles in this field?
Numerous papers have been published on Corona in Health Scope Journal. It is suggested

to use them to improve the quality of the manuscript in the introduction and discussion sections.
Best,

Tahereh Rahimi: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 9 Mar 2022

-The methodology for conducting a systematic review has not been implemented.
-Inappropriate keywords were selected for the search.
-Adequate information databases have not been selected.
-The findings are not well expressed.
-The study lacks the necessary discussion and comparisons.
-The quality of the selection of articles is problematic.
-References are very limited for a systematic review.

Hossein Ansari: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 18 Apr 2022

The authors have claimed that have done meta-analysis and checked the heterogeneity, whereas, they have not reported any data in this regard
However, this is a systematic review regarding a specific issue and is only acceptable as a “letter to the editor”

Fatemeh Setoodehzadeh: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 21 Apr 2022

Dear Authors,
According to the opinions of the reviewer's comments, the manuscript needs major corrections
Pay attention to the following points and amend the manuscript based on them:
- The authors have claimed that have done meta-analysis and checked the heterogeneity, whereas, they have not reported any data in this regard. Revise the manuscript in this regard.
- Abstract, Method: Specify the search time frame.
- Has the search been for articles from a specific country or region? Indicate detail.
- Introduction: Sources in the text should be written according to the journal instructions. It is recommended to see one of the published papers in the last issue of the journal.
- The structure of the article should be based on the journal. The Objective section should be written after the introduction.
- Method: Why the 2020 articles have not been reviewed.
- Please rewrite chart number 1 based on PRISMA flowchart.
- Table 1; kindly indicate the title of the paper, sample size, and country.
- Table 1, kindly writes the result of the study in more detail. E.g. What challenges have occurred for the health system and manpower?
- Write the discussion section separately.
- Indicate the grant number after the conclusion section.
- Have the authors cited their articles in this field?
- Numerous papers have been published on Corona in Health Scope Journal. It is suggested to use them to improve the quality of the manuscript in the introduction and discussion sections.

-use of appropriate keywords for the search.
-Adequate information databases have not been selected.
-The findings are not well expressed.
-The study lacks the necessary discussion and comparisons.
-The quality of the selection of articles is problematic. Check it
-References are very limited for a systematic review.

Ramazan Mirzaei: EIC | **Revision** (0) 27 Apr 2022

Dear Author

According to reviewer comments, the manuscript needs “Major revision”.
Best Regards

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (1)

Reply to Reviewers

Ideally, the reviewing process can significantly improve the submitted manuscripts by allowing the authors to take into account the advice of reviewers. Author(s) must reply to all reviewers' comments in a separate Word file, point by point. A "**Reply to Reviewers**" document is submitted along with revised manuscript during submission of revised files, summarizing the changes that the authors made in response to the reviewers' comments. The responses to reviewers' comments specifies how the authors addressed each comment the reviewers made.

You can read the authors' responses to the reviewers' comments in the next page.

Reply to Reviewer comments

Dear Editor
Health Scope

Subject: **Reply to the reviewers' comments**

Dear Editor

Thank you for reviewing and considering for publication of my manuscript titled **Impact of COVID-19 on the health system and health workers: A Systematic Review Article**
I have read all reviewer comments and editor comments and addressed all comments in my manuscript. Attached is the reply to
the comments table with this file. I have addressed all comments and answered each comment in this table.
I hope you are satisfied with my reply and accept my manuscript for publication. Any other comments, kindly send me I will address them appropriately.

I am looking forward to your response.

Regards

Corresponding Author

Reply to Reviewer comments

Reviewer Number	Original comments of the reviewer	Reply by the author(s)	Changes done on page number and line number
1	The authors have claimed that have done meta-analysis and checked the heterogeneity, whereas, they have not reported any data in this regard. This manuscript is a systematic review that has not reported any data for meta-analysis	Heterogeneity checked by funnel plot in figure 2 and it explained in statistical analysis part. All data are reported in the result and discussion section.	Page number 3 And line number 110-114
2	Abstract, Method section; kindly write the data analysis method. E.g. are you used of PRISMA method for data analysis?	Revision done and add the data analysis method	Page number 1 and line number 14-15
2	Results section: How many articles were investigated? Indicate it.	Total 10 articles were investigated. Already mentioned in	Page number 3 And line number 97
2	-Method section: Improve the design of Figure 1	Revision done, figure 1 has been revised.	Page number 4 Line numbers 98-99
2	Results Section: Improve the design of Table 1.	Revision is done, table 1 has been revised	Page number 6 Line numbers 124-125
2	-In table number one, the name of the first author should be mentioned instead of the study number	Revision done, replace the number with the first author in table 1	Page numbers 6-7 and line numbers 124-125
2	In the previous round, I indicated that "Numerous papers have been published on Corona in Health	Your point is irrelevant because this study focuses on the Impact of COVID on	Page number 8-10

Reply to Reviewer comments

	Scope Journal. It is suggested to use them to improve the quality of the manuscript in the introduction and discussion sections." Unfortunately, this comment was not made by the author. Kindly attention to it.	health workers and the health system, Only relevant study is included and the quality of the manuscript is already good. I address all comments as indicated by reviewers point by point	Line numbers 127-210
2	Unfortunately, some comments from the first round of review have not yet been made by the author. Please check	I address all comments as indicated by reviewers point by point	General comments and addressed
Associate Editor	This manuscript is a systematic review that has not reported any data for meta-analysis. In the second review round, the manuscript needs Minor Revision.	All data has been reported in the relevant section of results and discussion.	General comments and addressed
Associate Editor	- The authors have claimed that have done meta-analysis and checked the heterogeneity, whereas, they have not reported any data in this regard. Revise the manuscript in this regard.	Heterogeneity is checked by funnel plot in figure 2 and it is explained in the statistical analysis part. All data are reported in the result and discussion section.	Page number 3 And line number 110-114

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (1)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

Hossein Ansari: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 16 May 2022

The authors have claimed that have done meta-analysis and checked the heterogeneity, whereas, they have not reported
any data in this regard. This manuscript is a systematic review that has not reported any data for meta-analysis.

Fatemeh Setoodehzadeh: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 27 May 2022

• Dear Authors,
• Kindly attention to the following comments:
• Abstract, Method section; kindly write the data analysis method. E.g. are you using of PRISMA method for data analysis?
• Results section: How many articles were investigated? Indicate it.
• Method section: Improve the design of Figure 1
• Results Section: Improve the design of Table 1
• In table number one, the name of the first author should be mentioned instead of the study number
• In the previous round I indicated that "Numerous papers have been published on Corona in Health Scope Journal. It is suggested to use them to improve the quality of the manuscript in the introduction and discussion sections." Unfortunately, this comment was not made by the author. Kindly attention to it.
• Unfortunately, some comments from the first round of review have not yet been made by the author. Please check

Fatemeh Setoodehzadeh: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 27 May 2022

Dear Editor,
This manuscript is a systematic review that has not reported any data for meta-analysis.
In the second review round, the manuscript needs Minor Revision.

Ramazan Mirzaei: EIC | **Revision** (1) 5 Jun 2022

Dear Author
Thanks for submitting your valuable manuscript to the journal. As a result of this, we would like to inform you that the review of your manuscript is finished, and based on the editorial

decision, you need to do a "Minor Revision" on your manuscript. Even though this manuscript has enough quality to enter the review process, it needs some significant (minor) revisions from some points of view.

Best Regards

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

Reply to Reviewers

Ideally, the reviewing process can significantly improve the submitted manuscripts by allowing the authors to take into account the advice of reviewers. Author(s) must reply to all reviewers' comments in a separate Word file, point by point. A "**Reply to Reviewers**" document is submitted along with revised manuscript during submission of revised files, summarizing the changes that the authors made in response to the reviewers' comments. The responses to reviewers' comments specifies how the authors addressed each comment the reviewers made.

You can read the authors' responses to the reviewers' comments in the next page.

Reply to Reviewer comments

Dear Editor
Health Scope

Subject: **Reply to the reviewers' comments**

Dear Editor

Thank you for reviewing and considering for publication of my manuscript titled **Impact of COVID-19 on the health system and health workers: A Systematic Review Article**
I have read all reviewer comments and editor comments and addressed all comments in my manuscript. Attached is the reply to the comments table with this file. I have addressed all comments and answered each comment in this table.
I hope you are satisfied with my reply and accept my manuscript for publication. Any other comments, kindly send me I will address them appropriately.

I am looking forward to your response.

Regards

Corresponding Author

Reply to Reviewer comments

Reviewer Number	Original comments of the reviewer	Reply by the author(s)	Changes are done on the page number and line number

Reply to Reviewer comments

1	The methodology for conducting a systematic review has not been implemented.	Revision done	3
1	Inappropriate keywords were selected for the search.	Revision done	1
1	-Adequate information databases have not been selected.	Revision done	3
	-The findings are not well expressed.	Revision done	4
	-The study lacks the necessary discussion and comparisons.	Revision done	9
	-The quality of the selection of articles is problematic.	Revision done	10
	-References are very limited for a systematic review.	Add more references	13-14
2	Abstract, Method: Specify the search time frame.	Revision done	1
	Has the search been for articles from a specific country or region? Indicate detail.	The pandemic affects all countries are covered	
	Introduction: Sources in the text should be written according to the journal instructions. It is recommended to see one of the published papers in the last issue of the journal.	Revision done	3
	The structure of the article should be based on the journal. The Objective section should be written after the introduction.	Revision done	All manuscript
	Method: Why the 2020 articles	2020 articles have been	4

Reply to Reviewer comments

	have not been reviewed?	added	
	Please rewrite chart number 1 based on the PRISMA flowchart.	Revision done	5
	Table 1, Kindly indicate the title of the paper, sample size, and country.	Revision done	5
	Table 1, kindly write the result of the study in more detail. E.g. What challenges have occurred for the health system and manpower?	Revision done	5
	Write the discussion section separately.	A discussion section has been added	10
	Indicate the grant number after the conclusion section.	No need for a grant number its a systematic review	
	Have the authors cited their articles in this field?	no	
	Numerous papers have been published on Corona in Health Scope Journal. It is suggested to use them to improve the quality of the manuscript in the introduction and discussion sections.	Revision done	all

Reply to Reviewer comments

3	The authors have claimed that have done meta-analysis and checked the heterogeneity, whereas, they have not reported any data in this regard	Revision done	6
Associate Editor	- The authors have claimed that have done meta-analysis and checked the heterogeneity, whereas, they have not reported any data in this regard. Revise the manuscript in this regard.	Revision done	6
	- Abstract, Method: Specify the search time frame.	Revision done	1
	- Has the search been for articles from a specific country or region? Indicate detail.	The pandemic affects all countries and takes data all over the world	
	- Introduction: Sources in the text should be written according to the journal instructions. It is recommended to see one of the published papers in the last issue of the journal.	Revision done	
	- The structure of the article should be based on the journal. The Objective section should be written after the introduction.	Revision done	

Reply to Reviewer comments

	- Method: Why the 2020 articles have not been reviewed.	Now 2020 article has been added	
	- Please rewrite chart number 1 based on the PRISMA flowchart.	Revision done	6
	- Table 1, Kindly indicate the title of the paper, sample size, and country.	Revision done	6
	- Table 1, kindly write the result of the study with more detail. E.g. What challenges have occurred for the health system and manpower?	Revision done	6
	- Write the discussion section separately.	Revision done	
	- Indicate the grant number after the conclusion section.	It's a systematic review No need to grant the number	
	- Have the authors cited their articles in this field?	No	
	- Numerous papers have been published on Corona in Health Scope Journal. It is suggested to use them to improve the quality of the manuscript in the introduction	Revision done	

Reply to Reviewer comments

	and discussion sections.		
	-use of appropriate keywords for the search.	Revision done	
	-Adequate information databases have not been selected.	Revision done	
	-The findings are not well expressed.	Revision done	
	-The study lacks the necessary discussion and comparisons.	Revision done	
	-The quality of the selection of articles is problematic. Check it	Revision done	
	-References are very limited for a systematic review.	References have been added	

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

Fatemeh Setoodehzadeh: Reviewer | **Revision** (2) 21 Jun 2022

Dear Editor,
The manuscript entitled: Impact of COVID-19 on the health system and health workers: A Systematic Review Article" has been revised based on the previous comments. I believed that the manuscript is ready for publication.
Best,

Fatemeh Setoodehzadeh: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) 21 Jun 2022

Dear Editor,
In the third review round my decision is accepted.
Sincerely,

Ramazan Mirzaei: EIC | **Revision** (2) 29 Jun 2022

Dear Author
According to reviewer comments, we congratulate to inform you that your article has been accepted for publication in this journal and we thank you for trusting us. As an expert in the field, you are best placed to explain why your article is exciting or impactful to a broader so if you fulfill your other commitments in a timely manner, your article will be published in this journal at the appointed time.
Kind regards